

# Performance Analysis of Arbitrarily-Shaped Underlay Cognitive Networks: Effect of Secondary User Activity Protocols

Jing Guo, *Student Member, IEEE*, Salman Durrani, *Senior Member, IEEE* and  
Xiangyun Zhou, *Member, IEEE*

## Abstract

This paper analyzes the performance of the primary and secondary users (SUs) in an arbitrarily-shaped underlay cognitive network. We consider different SU activity protocols and their effects on a primary receiver (PU-Rx) at an arbitrary location. We propose a framework, based on the moment generating function (MGF) of the interference due to a random SU, to analytically compute the outage probability in the primary network, as well as the average number of active SUs in the secondary network. The latter metric provides a measure of the efficiency of spectrum reuse in underlay cognitive networks. We also propose a cooperation-based SU activity protocol in the underlay cognitive network which includes the existing threshold-based protocol as a special case. A tradeoff analysis between the outage probability in the primary network and the average number of active SUs is provided in this paper, and we employ it as an analytical approach to compare the effect of different SU activity protocols on the performance of the primary and secondary networks.

## Index Terms

Cognitive network, aggregate interference, outage probability, stochastic geometry, secondary user activity protocol.

## I. INTRODUCTION

To address the spectrum scarcity and the inefficient spectrum usage of present wireless systems, opportunistic spectrum access via cognitive radio technology is proposed by the Federal Communication Commissions (FCC) [1]–[3]. In cognitive networks, the unlicensed secondary users (SUs) access the licensed spectrum band in an efficient and opportunistic fashion, without impairing the performance of licensed primary users (PUs) [4]. In order to achieve this the SUs are equipped with cognitive capability [1] so that they can adjust their operating system parameters, e.g., transmission power, frequency, modulation type, according to the surrounding wireless environment [5], [6].

In general, cognitive networks can be classified into two types in terms of the access technology of the licensed spectrum sharing [7], [8]. In the *overlay cognitive network*, SUs are only allowed to access the portion of spectrum which is not occupied by the licensed users. As a result, the spectrum sensing techniques have to be adopted by the SUs in order to monitor the spectrum to be used [9]–[11]. In the *underlay cognitive network*, unlicensed SUs can concurrently use the spectrum occupied by a PU by guaranteeing that the interference temperature at the PU is not beyond the interference temperature limit [4]. This interference temperature is a metric established by the FCC to measure the average amount of interference power available at a receiving antenna to be delivered to the licensed receiver for a given frequency band [12]. Due to the uncertainty associated with the random location of the SUs and the fading environment, the interference from the SUs can severely impair the PU's performance. Consequently, it is important to investigate the interference arising from the SUs to a PU. This interference impacts the outage probability at a PU, which is the probability that the signal to noise plus interference ratio (SINR) falls below a given threshold.

The interference and outage in overlay cognitive networks have been well investigated in the literature [9], [13]–[17]. For underlay cognitive networks, which are considered in this paper, the authors in [18]–[21] have recently examined the interference and outage performance. Specifically, the aggregate interference between primary and secondary users inside an infinite area cognitive network, taking the

exclusion region around PUs into account, was presented in [18] and bounds on the outage probability with Rayleigh fading channels were also derived. The closed-form results for the moment generating function (MGF) of the aggregate interference and the mean interference for the case of a reference PU located at the center of an annulus-shaped region were derived in [19]. A framework for characterizing the aggregate interference in cognitive networks was proposed in [20] for the disk region under the Rayleigh fading channel assumption. Therein, closed-form results were obtained for the special case that the path-loss exponent is 2 or 4 with an arbitrary location of PU inside a disk region. However, in practice the shape of network can be arbitrary and need not be a disk only. In addition, the PU may be located anywhere inside the network region. When SUs are confined within an arbitrarily-shaped finite region, the aggregate interference and the outage probability are strongly influenced by the shape of region and the position of the PU. In this context, a method of calculating the approximation of  $n$ -th cumulant inside a non-circular region by dividing the areas into infinitesimal circular sections was suggested in [21] but no explicit formulation was provided. Therefore, it is still largely an open research problem to find general frameworks for analyzing the interference and outage in arbitrarily-shaped finite underlay cognitive networks.

In underlay cognitive networks, the SU activity protocol employed at the SUs has a great impact not only on the outage performance in the primary network, but also on the performance in the secondary network in terms of the average number of active SUs. The function of the SU activity protocol is to control the interference generated by the SUs by limiting the number of active SUs in order to satisfy the interference temperature limit. In this context, [18], [19] considered an exclusion or guard zone around the PUs, within which SUs are not allowed to transmit. A threshold-based protocol was proposed in [21], where the activity of each SU depends on the instantaneous power detected by the SU on the PU's uplink channel. It must be noted that if no activity constraint is imposed on SUs then this is equivalent to the well-studied case of wireless ad hoc networks where all users can transmit [22]–[24]. While the existing literature has examined the performance in the primary network [18]–[21], the performance in

the secondary network, in terms of the average number of active SUs, has been largely ignored.

In this paper, we focus on characterizing the performance of the underlay cognitive network in terms of the performance in both the primary network and the secondary network. We propose a general framework for analyzing the performance of arbitrarily-shaped underlay cognitive networks, with arbitrary location of the PU and different SU activity protocols. We make the following major contributions in this paper:

- We utilize the cooperation among SUs in the underlay cognitive network to come up with a cooperation-based SU activity protocol. This protocol utilizes the local information exchange among SUs and includes the threshold-based protocol as a special case. We derive approximate yet accurate expressions for the MGF and the  $n$ -th cumulant of the aggregate interference from SUs with the cooperation-based protocol.
- We derive the general expressions for the MGF and  $n$ -th cumulant of the aggregate interference at the PU for the existing SU activity protocols. We show that many existing closed-form results in the literature for the interference analysis in the primary network can be obtained as special cases in our framework. In addition, we derive a closed-form result for the average number of active SUs, which is an important performance metric for the secondary network. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that such a result has been obtained in the literature for the case of underlay cognitive network.
- We propose a tradeoff analysis between the outage probability at the PU and the average number of active SUs, and employ it as a method to compare the performance of the primary and secondary networks for different SU activity protocols. Our comparison shows that the guard zone protocol, which relies on the long-term sensing signal monitoring, performs the best. The cooperation-based protocol is the next best, outperforming the threshold-based protocol. The advantage of the cooperation-based protocol over the guard zone protocol is that it relies on the instantaneous sensing signal monitoring and hence is more applicable in practice.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section II presents the detailed system model and

assumptions and describes the four different SU activity protocols, including the proposed cooperation-based protocol. The proposed mathematical framework is presented in Section III. The analysis for the interference and the average number of active SUs is presented in Section IV and Section V, respectively. Numerical and simulation results to study the aggregate interference, outage probability and average number of active SUs are discussed in Section VI. Finally, conclusions are presented in Section VII.

The following notation is used in the paper. The probability distribution function (PDF) and the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of a random variable (RV)  $Z$  are represented by  $f_Z(\cdot)$  and  $F_Z(\cdot)$ , respectively.  $\mathbb{E}_Z\{\cdot\}$  denotes the expectation with respect to random variable  $Z$  and  $\mathbb{E}_Z^{pt}\{n, l, u\} = \int_l^u z^n f_Z(z) dz$  represents the  $n$ th-order partial moment of RV  $Z$  calculated within the interval  $[l, u]$ .  $\mathcal{M}_Z(s)$  is the moment generating function of the RV  $Z$  with PDF  $f_Z(\cdot)$ .  $\mu_Z(n)$  and  $\kappa_Z(n)$  denote the  $n$ -th moment and  $n$ -th cumulant of a RV  $Z$  respectively. Additionally,  $\Gamma[\cdot]$  denotes the gamma function and  ${}_2F_1[\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  is the Gaussian or ordinary hypergeometric function [25].

## II. SYSTEM MODEL

We consider an underlay cognitive network with a PU link, comprising of a PU transmitter (PU-Tx) and a PU receiver (PU-Rx) separated by a distance  $r_0$ , and  $M$  SUs. The network region  $\mathcal{A}$  is an arbitrarily-shaped finite region, where  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $\mathbb{R}^2$  denotes the two-dimensional Euclidean space. We do not place any restriction on the location of the PU-Tx and PU-Rx and they can be located anywhere inside the network region  $\mathcal{A}$ . A primary exclusion zone  $\mathcal{B}$ , with radius  $\epsilon$ , is formed around the PU-Rx and no user is allowed to enter this region [26]. The SU locations are modeled according to a uniform Binomial Point Process (BPP), i.e., the  $M$  SUs are independently and uniformly distributed (i.u.d.) at random inside the region  $\mathcal{A}'$ , where  $\mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}$  and  $\setminus$  denotes the set exclusion operator.

The SUs decide whether to transmit or not depending on the adopted SU activity protocol (discussed later in this section). We assume that all the nodes operate in the frequency division duplex mode. In order to detect the presence of PU-Rx, each SU senses the PU's reverse link, i.e., from PU-Rx to PU-Tx. In other words, the detection is achieved by receiving the signal transmitted by PU-Rx for each SU, via




Fig. 1. Illustration of secondary user spatial activity protocols in underlay cognitive network ( $\blacktriangle$  = interfered PU-Rx,  $\blacksquare$  = PU-Tx,  $\circ$  = inactive secondary user,  $\bullet$  = active secondary user).  $S_j$  and  $V_j$  ( $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ) denote the side and vertex, respectively.

the sensing channel. We assume that the sensing channel (from PU-Rx to SU) and the SU transmitting (i.e., interfering) channel (from SU to PU-Rx) are well separated in the frequency band so that these two channels can be regarded as fully uncorrelated. These assumptions have also been adopted in [21]. Our aim is to characterize the aggregate interference, generated by the SUs at the PU-Rx under the different SU activity protocols and its impact on the system performance in terms of the outage probability in the primary network and the number of active SUs.

Let the RV  $R_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$ ) denote the random distance between the  $i$ -th SU and the PU-Rx

with probability distribution function  $f_{R_i}(r_i)$ . We denote the transmit power of the PU-Tx as  $P_{T_0}$  and the transmit power of each SU as  $P_{T_i}$ . For the sensing channel, we denote the transmit power of PU-Rx as  $P_{T_S}$ . We assume that all users have a single antenna and the wireless communication channel is modeled as a path-loss and fading channel. Let  $G_i$  represent the instantaneous power gain due to fading on the SU transmitting channel from  $i$ -th SU to the PU-Rx with fading distribution function  $f_{G_i}(g_i)$  and  $H_i$  represent the instantaneous fading power gain on the sensing channel with the distribution function  $f_{H_i}(h_i)$ .

For the above setup, the interference at the PU-Rx generated from the  $i$ -th SU is given by

$$I_i = P_{T_i} G_i R_i^{-\alpha} \mathbf{1}_{(\text{condition})}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha$  is the path-loss exponent which is typically in the range  $2 \leq \alpha \leq 6$  [27]. The indicator function  $\mathbf{1}_{(\text{condition})}$  is equal to one if and only if the condition inside it holds. Otherwise, the indicator function is zero, which means that the  $i$ -th SU is inactive and does not generate any interference to the PU-Rx. Note that the unbounded path-loss model is used in (1). However, the singularity at  $R_i = 0$  is avoided because of the primary exclusion zone around the PU-Rx, i.e., the random distance  $R_i$  is always greater than  $\epsilon$  ( $\epsilon \geq 1$ ) [9].

The aggregate interference at PU-Rx is given by

$$I_{\text{agg}} = \sum_{i=1}^M I_i = \sum_{i=1}^M P_{T_i} G_i R_i^{-\alpha} \mathbf{1}_{(\text{condition})}. \quad (2)$$

The condition in (1) and (2) depends on the different SU activity protocols. This is discussed, in detail, along with the definition of each activity protocol, in the following subsections.

#### A. Full Activity Protocol

This is an unregulated activity protocol, in which all the SUs are in active status and share the same spectrum occupied by the PU-Rx. This is depicted in Fig. 1(a). Since all the SUs are active, the indicator function in (1) and (2) is always equal to one and we can rewrite the aggregate interference in (2) as

$$I_{\text{agg}} = \sum_{i=1}^M P_{T_i} G_i R_i^{-\alpha}. \quad (3)$$

### B. Guard Zone Protocol

The guard zone protocol, in the context of cognitive networks, was proposed in [18], [19]. In this protocol, the SUs are permitted to enter the guard zone region but once a SU intrudes into it, it is prohibited from transmitting. This is illustrated in Fig. 1(b), where there is a guard zone region around the PU-Rx with radius  $r_f$ . Consequently, the two SUs that are inside this region are inactive and do not generate any interference to the PU-Rx. The aggregate interference under the guard zone protocol can be written as

$$I_{\text{agg}} = \sum_{i=1}^M P_{T_i} G_i R_i^{-\alpha} \mathbf{1}_{(R_i > r_f)}. \quad (4)$$

### C. Threshold-based Protocol

The threshold-based protocol was proposed in [21]. In this protocol, each SU senses the instantaneous signal power transmitted by the PU-Rx on the sensing channel. If the received instantaneous signal power at the  $i$ -th SU is greater than the activation threshold  $\gamma$ , i.e.,  $P_{T_S} H_i R_i^{-\alpha} > \gamma$ , it becomes silent and does not interfere with the PU-Rx. Otherwise, it is permitted to share the spectrum with the PU-Rx, as illustrated in Fig. 1(c). Hence, for the threshold-based protocol, the aggregate interference can be written as

$$I_{\text{agg}} = \sum_{i=1}^M P_{T_i} G_i R_i^{-\alpha} \mathbf{1}_{(P_{T_S} H_i R_i^{-\alpha} \leq \gamma)}. \quad (5)$$

### D. Cooperation-based Protocol

This is the new protocol proposed in this paper and is illustrated in Fig. 1(d). The basic idea of this protocol is inspired from the cooperative spectrum sensing in overlay cognitive networks, where cooperation among nodes helps to improve the detection of licensed spectrum occupancy [9], [15].

In the proposed cooperation-based protocol for underlay cognitive networks, each SU detects the sensing signal from the PU-Rx and makes an initial decision on activation, which is then broadcast to its peers. For analytical convenience, we assume that only the SUs within a certain range, which is known as the cooperation range  $r_c$ , can correctly receive the initial decisions from other SUs. Finally, the SU applies

the AND rule on these initial decisions to decide whether it is active or not. Consequently, each SU is permitted to be active as long as its preliminary decision is to be active, and the initial decision of those SUs who fall into its cooperation range is to be active as well. Mathematically, the aggregate interference generated at the PU-Rx is

$$I_{\text{agg}} = \sum_{i=1}^M P_{T_i} G_i R_i^{-\alpha} \mathbf{1}_{(\Pi_d(\mathcal{D}_i(r_c) \times \mathcal{A}') = \emptyset)}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\Pi_d$  denotes the set of SUs whose detected signal power on the sensing channel is greater than the activation threshold  $\gamma$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_i(r_c)$  represents the disk cooperation region centered at the  $i$ -th SU and  $\emptyset$  denotes the null set.

Note that when  $r_c = 0$ , the cooperation-based protocol is the same as the threshold-based protocol. Thus, the proposed cooperation-based protocol includes the threshold-based protocol as a special case.

*Remark 1:* Both the cooperation-based and threshold-based protocols require the SU to detect the instantaneous signal power transmitted by the PU-Rx on the sensing channel. As such, they are much more applicable in practice. However, the guard zone protocol requires the SU to detect the signal power on the sensing channel over a relatively long period of time and then average it to determine its distance to the PU-Rx, before deciding whether to transmit or not. As such, this protocol is not suitable for the scenarios where the SUs need to transmit without too much delay.

### III. MATHEMATICAL FRAMEWORK

In this section, we present the proposed mathematical framework to characterize the interference and outage in underlay cognitive networks with different SU activity protocols. The aggregate interference from the secondary network in (2) is a stochastic process that strongly relies on the random location of the SUs inside the arbitrarily-shaped finite cognitive network region and the random fading channel gains. Since there is no available general expression for the PDF of the aggregate interference [28], we adopt the moment generating function approach to analyze the interference and outage in this paper. Previous work [20], [21] has also adopted the MGF approach. However, their focus is on analysing the statistics of

the aggregate interference in the primary network only and the results are limited to specific, e.g., annulus-shaped regions. We consider arbitrarily-shaped cognitive network regions and analyze the performance in both the primary network (i.e., the aggregate interference in Section IV) and the secondary network (i.e., the average number of active SUs in Section V).

#### A. Assumptions

In this paper, we consider that the nodes are independently and uniformly distributed inside the network region  $\mathcal{A}'$ , which results in the distribution function of  $R_i$  being the same for all  $i$ . Moreover, the fading gain on all communication channels is independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) Nakagami- $m$  fading. This type of fading is widely considered in the wireless communications literature [27]. The transmit power for different SUs are assumed to be the same. Consequently, the distribution of interference from  $i$ -th SU becomes identical and we can drop the index  $i$  in the  $P_{T_i}$ ,  $I_i$ ,  $R_i$ ,  $G_i$ ,  $H_i$  and let  $f_{R_i}(r_i) = f_R(r)$ ,  $f_{G_i}(g_i) = f_G(g)$  and  $f_{H_i}(h_i) = f_H(h)$ .

For Nakagami- $m$  fading, the distribution of the power gain on the SU transmitting channel and the sensing channel can be modeled by a Gamma distribution as [29]

$$f_G(g) = \frac{g^{m_g-1} m_g^{m_g}}{\Gamma[m_g]} \exp(-m_g g), \quad (7)$$

$$f_H(h) = \frac{h^{m_h-1} m_h^{m_h}}{\Gamma[m_h]} \exp(-m_h h), \quad (8)$$

where  $m_g$  and  $m_h$  represent the fading parameters, which control the severity of the fading. Note that  $m_g = m_h = 1$  corresponds to Rayleigh fading channels. In addition, the  $n$ -th moment of the fading power gain on the SU transmitting channel, which is needed in the analysis in Section IV, is available in closed-form as [30]

$$\mathbb{E}_G \{G^n\} = \frac{(m_g + n - 1)!}{m_g^n (m_g - 1)!}. \quad (9)$$

#### B. Distance Distributions

The proposed formulation relies on the knowledge of the distance distribution  $f_R(r)$ , i.e., the PDF of the distance of a random SU from the PU-Rx. For a disk region,  $f_R(r)$  is well known [13], [15], [19]–[22].

Recently, [24] proposed an algorithm to determine  $f_R(r)$  for the case of a random node located anywhere inside an arbitrarily-shaped convex polygon. For an  $L$ -sided arbitrarily-shaped convex polygon, depending on the location of the random node, the distance distribution can be a complicated piece-wise function with  $2L - 1$  terms [31]. Nevertheless, it can be determined in closed-form. Once  $f_R(r)$  is determined using the algorithm in [24], the expectation  $\mathbb{E}_R \{R^{-n\alpha}\}$  involving the RV  $R$ , which is needed in the analysis in Section IV, can be easily calculated in closed-form.

### C. Moment Generating Function

In general, the moment generating function of the aggregate interference is defined as [32]

$$\mathcal{M}_{I_{\text{agg}}}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{I_{\text{agg}}} \{ \exp(-s I_{\text{agg}}) \}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{I_{\text{agg}}} \{\cdot\}$  denotes the expectation with respect to the RV  $I_{\text{agg}}$ . Assuming that the interference from each SU is independent and identical, the moment generating function of the aggregate interference in (10) can be rewritten as [33]

$$\mathcal{M}_{I_{\text{agg}}}(s) = (\mathcal{M}_I(s))^M, \quad (11)$$

where  $I$  denotes the interference generated by a random SU and  $\mathcal{M}_I(s) = \mathbb{E}_I \{ \exp(-s I) \}$  corresponds to the MGF of  $I$ .

### D. $n$ -th Cumulant

The  $n$ -th cumulant of the aggregate interference can be written in terms of the MGF of the aggregate interference as [29]

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{I_{\text{agg}}}(n) &= (-1)^n \left. \frac{d^n \ln \mathcal{M}_{I_{\text{agg}}}(s)}{ds^n} \right|_{s=0} \\ &= (-1)^n M \left. \frac{d^n \ln \mathcal{M}_I(s)}{ds^n} \right|_{s=0} \\ &= M \kappa_I(n) \\ &= M \left( \mu_I(n) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{j-1} \kappa_I(j) \mu_I(n-j) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the last step comes from the recursive moment-cumulant relationship [22], and  $\kappa_I(n)$  and  $\mu_I(n)$  represent the  $n$ -th cumulant and  $n$ -th moment of the interference from a random SU respectively. Note that  $\mu_I(n)$  can also be directly related to  $\mathcal{M}_I(s)$  by [29]

$$\mu_I(n) = (-1)^n \left. \frac{d^n \mathcal{M}_I(s)}{ds^n} \right|_{s=0}. \quad (13)$$

### E. Outage Probability

The outage probability is an important metric to evaluate the cognitive network's performance over fading channels. It is defined as the probability that the signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio drops below a threshold  $\beta$ . Formally, the outage probability can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{out}} &= \Pr(\text{SINR} < \beta) \\ &= \Pr\left(\frac{P_{T_0} r_0^{-\alpha} G_0}{N + I_{\text{agg}}} < \beta\right), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where  $N$  is the additive white Gaussian noise power. As the node distribution of SUs follows a uniform BPP, the location of each SU is not fixed all the time. In this paper, we are interested in the spatially averaged outage probability which is spatially averaged over both the possible location of SUs and the fading channels.

When the fading on the desired link (from PU-Tx to PU-Rx) follows the general distribution defined in [34, (9)] (an important special case of which is Nakagami- $m$  fading with integer  $m$  value), we can employ the reference link power gain-based (RLPG-based) framework proposed in [24] to evaluate the spatially averaged outage probability. The basic principle of this framework is to find the CDF of the reference link's fading power gain, which can then be used to find the outage probability. For Nakagami- $m$  fading channels, the spatially averaged outage probability is given by [24]

$$P_{\text{out}} = 1 - \exp\left(-m_0 \frac{\beta}{\rho_0}\right) \sum_{k=0}^{m_0-1} \frac{m_0^k}{k!} \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \left(\frac{\beta}{\rho_0}\right)^{k-j} \left(\frac{\beta r_0^\alpha}{P_{T_0}}\right)^j \sum_{t_1+t_2+\dots+t_M=j} \binom{j}{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_M} \prod_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E}_I \left\{ \exp\left(-m_0 \frac{\beta r_0^\alpha}{P_{T_0}} I\right) (I)^{t_i} \right\}, \quad (15)$$

where  $\rho_0 = \frac{P_{T_0} r_0^{-\alpha}}{N}$  indicates the average signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) and  $m_0$  denotes the fading parameter on the desired link.

Using the frequency differentiation property of Laplace transform, the Laplace transform of the term  $z^n f(z)$  is given by  $(-1)^n \frac{d^n \mathcal{M}_Z(s)}{ds^n}$ . Then the expectation term in (15) can be expressed in terms of the MGF of the interference due to a random SU as

$$\mathbb{E}_I \left\{ \exp \left( -m_0 \frac{\beta r_0^\alpha}{P_{T_0}} I \right) (I)^{t_i} \right\} = (-1)^{t_i} \frac{d^{t_i} \mathcal{M}_I(s)}{ds^{t_i}} \Big|_{s=m_0 \frac{\beta r_0^\alpha}{P_{T_0}}}. \quad (16)$$

Examining (11), (12) and (15), we can see that the proposed mathematical formulation depends on the MGF of the interference due to a random SU  $\mathcal{M}_I(s)$ . This is determined for the four SU activity protocols in the next section.

#### IV. INTERFERENCE ANALYSIS

In this section, we derive the general expressions characterizing the MGF of the interference from a random SU for the different SU activity protocols.

##### A. Full Activity Protocol

With the full activity, there is no constraint imposed on the SUs. The main result is summarized in Theorem 1 below.

*Theorem 1:* For the full activity protocol, the MGF of the interference at an arbitrarily located PU-Rx due to an independently and uniformly distributed SU inside an arbitrarily-shaped finite region is

$$\mathcal{M}_I(s) = \int_0^\infty \int_\epsilon^{r_{\max}} \exp(-s P_T g r^{-\alpha}) f_R(r) f_G(g) dr dg, \quad (17)$$

where  $r_{\max}$  denotes the maximum range of the random variable  $R$ , which depends on the shape of the finite region  $\mathcal{A}$  and the location of the PU-Rx.

*Corollary 1:* For the full activity protocol, the  $n$ -th moment of the interference at an arbitrarily located PU-Rx due to an independently and uniformly distributed SU inside an arbitrarily-shaped finite region is

$$\mu_I(n) = P_T^n \mathbb{E}_G \{G^n\} \mathbb{E}_R \{R^{-n\alpha}\}, \quad (18)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_G \{G^n\}$  is given in (9) under the Nakagami- $m$  fading channel assumption and  $\mathbb{E}_R \{R^{-n\alpha}\}$  can be computed in closed-form with the approach in [24].

Proof of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1: See Appendix A-A.

*Special Case of Disk Region:* When the PU-Rx is located at the center of a disk region with radius  $W$  (equivalently, the SUs are i.u.d. inside an annulus ring), the distance distribution function is given by

$$f_R(r) = \frac{2\pi r}{|\mathcal{A}'|}, \quad \epsilon \leq r \leq W, \quad (19)$$

where  $|\mathcal{A}'| = \pi(W^2 - \epsilon^2)$  denotes the area of the underlay secondary network region.

Substituting (19) and (7) into (17) and (18), we can obtain the closed-form results of the MGF and  $n$ -th moment of the interference from a random SU as

$$\mathcal{M}_I(s) = \frac{\pi \left( W^2 {}_2F_1 \left[ m_g, -\frac{2}{\alpha}, \frac{-2+\alpha}{\alpha}, -\frac{W^{-\alpha}sP_T}{m_g} \right] - \epsilon^2 {}_2F_1 \left[ m_g, -\frac{2}{\alpha}, \frac{-2+\alpha}{\alpha}, -\frac{\epsilon^{-\alpha}sP_T}{m_g} \right] \right)}{|\mathcal{A}'|}, \quad (20)$$

$$\mu_I(n) = P_T^n \frac{(m_g + n - 1)!}{m_g^n (m_g - 1)!} \frac{2\pi (W^{2-n\alpha} - \epsilon^{2-n\alpha})}{|\mathcal{A}'|(2 - n\alpha)}. \quad (21)$$

*Remark 2:* The disk region or annulus-shaped region with centered PU-Rx is the most popular scenario and has been widely analyzed in previous works [19]–[22]. Under the Nakagami- $m$  fading assumption, the result from the substitution of (20) into (11) is identical to the result in [22, eq. (6)]. In addition, the  $n$ -th cumulant calculated from (21) and (12) is the same as the result from [22].

### B. Guard Zone Protocol

For this protocol, the SUs within the guard zone region do not transmit. The main result is summarized in Theorem 2.

*Theorem 2:* For the guard zone protocol, the MGF of the interference at an arbitrarily located PU-Rx due to an independently and uniformly distributed SU inside an arbitrarily-shaped finite region is

$$\mathcal{M}_I(s) = \int_0^\infty \int_{r_f}^{r_{\max}} \exp(-sP_T g r^{-\alpha}) f_R(r) f_G(g) dr dg + F_R(r_f), \quad (22)$$

where  $F_R(\cdot)$  represents the cumulative distribution function of the distance of a random SU from the PU-Rx, which can be determined by the algorithm in [24].

*Corollary 2:* For the guard zone protocol, the  $n$ -th moment of the interference at an arbitrarily located PU-Rx due to an independently and uniformly distributed SU inside an arbitrarily-shaped finite region is

$$\mu_I(n) = P_T^n \mathbb{E}_G \{G^n\} \mathbb{E}_R^{pt} \{-n\alpha, r_f, r_{\max}\}. \quad (23)$$

Proof of Theorem 2 and Corollary 2: See Appendix A-B.

*Special Case of Disk Region:* When the PU-Rx is located at the center of a disk region with radius  $W$ , substituting (19) and (7) into (22) and (23), yields the following closed-form results

$$\mathcal{M}_I(s) = \frac{\pi \left( W^2 {}_2F_1 \left[ m_g, -\frac{2}{\alpha}, \frac{-2+\alpha}{\alpha}, -\frac{W^{-\alpha}sP_T}{m_g} \right] - r_f^2 {}_2F_1 \left[ m_g, -\frac{2}{\alpha}, \frac{-2+\alpha}{\alpha}, -\frac{r_f^{-\alpha}sP_T}{m_g} \right] + r_f^2 - \epsilon^2 \right)}{|\mathcal{A}'|}, \quad (24)$$

$$\mu_I(n) = P_T^n \frac{(m_g + n - 1)!}{m_g^n (m_g - 1)!} \frac{2\pi (W^{2-n\alpha} - r_f^{2-n\alpha})}{|\mathcal{A}'|(2 - n\alpha)}. \quad (25)$$

*Remark 3:* In the full activity protocol, a SU located within the maximum range of  $\epsilon$  and  $r_{\max}$  generates interference to the PU-Rx. However, in the guard zone protocol, an SU located within the smaller range of  $r_f$  and  $r_{\max}$  generates interference to the PU-Rx. Thus, (25) (or (23)) is the same as (21) (or (18)), except that  $\epsilon$  is replaced by  $r_f$ .

### C. Threshold-based Protocol

In this protocol, the activity of each SU depends on the instantaneous signal power detected on the sensing channel. The main result is summarized in Theorem 3.

*Theorem 3:* For the threshold-based protocol, assuming the sensing channel is fully uncorrelated with the SU transmitting channel, the MGF of the interference at an arbitrarily located PU-Rx due to an independently and uniformly distributed SU inside an arbitrarily-shaped finite region is

$$\mathcal{M}_I(s) = \int_0^\infty \int_\epsilon^{r_{\max}} \exp(-sP_T g r^{-\alpha}) F_H \left( \frac{\gamma r^\alpha}{P_{T_S}} \right) f_R(r) f_G(g) dr dg + 1 - \int_\epsilon^{r_{\max}} F_H \left( \frac{\gamma r^\alpha}{P_{T_S}} \right) f_R(r) dr, \quad (26)$$

where  $F_H(\cdot)$  denotes the CDF of the fading power gain on sensing channel.

*Corollary 3:* For the threshold-based protocol, the  $n$ -th moment of the interference at an arbitrarily located PU-Rx due to an independently and uniformly distributed SU inside an arbitrarily-shaped finite region is

$$\mu_I(n) = P_T^n \mathbb{E}_G \{G^n\} \mathbb{E}_R \left\{ F_H \left( \frac{\gamma R^\alpha}{P_{T_S}} \right) R^{-n\alpha} \right\}. \quad (27)$$

Proof of Theorem 3 and Corollary 3: See Appendix A-C.

*Special Case of Disk Region:* Because of the additional term  $F_H(\cdot)$  in the MGF (26), it is not possible to find the closed-form solution for the case that PU-Rx is located at the center of a disk region. However, the  $n$ -th moment can be expressed in closed-form as

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_I(n) = & P_T^n \frac{(m_g + n - 1)!}{m_g^n (m_g - 1)!} \frac{2\pi}{|\mathcal{A}'|(2 - n\alpha)} \left( W^{2-n\alpha} \frac{\Gamma[m_h, 0, m_h \gamma W^\alpha / P_{T_S}]}{\Gamma[m_h]} \right. \\ & \left. - \epsilon^{2-n\alpha} \frac{\Gamma[m_h, 0, m_h \gamma \epsilon^\alpha / P_{T_S}]}{\Gamma[m_h]} - \left( \frac{m_h \gamma}{P_{T_S}} \right)^{n-\frac{2}{\alpha}} \frac{\Gamma[m_h - n + \frac{2}{\alpha}, m_h \gamma \epsilon^\alpha / P_{T_S}, m_h \gamma W^\alpha / P_{T_S}]}{\Gamma[m_h]} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

*Remark 4:* (28) is equivalent to the result in [21]. However, the method of calculating the  $n$ -th cumulant in [21] is only applicable for the special case that PU-Rx is located at the center of the disk region.

#### D. Cooperation-based Protocol

For the cooperation-based protocol, the activity of each SU is determined by itself as well as other SUs within its cooperative range. Thus, the interference due to each SU is not independent and (11) is not strictly valid. The analysis in the presence of correlated interference is an important open research problem. In this paper, we still use (11) to derive approximate analytical results for the cooperation-based protocol. We show that these results are accurate under certain conditions, which will be discussed in detail in Section VI. The main result is summarized in Theorem 4 below.

*Theorem 4:* For the cooperation-based protocol, the MGF of the interference at an arbitrarily located PU-Rx due to an independently and uniformly distributed SU inside an arbitrarily-shaped finite region is

approximated by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_I(s) \approx & \int_0^\infty \int_\epsilon^{r_{\max}} \exp(-sP_T g r^{-\alpha}) F_H\left(\frac{\gamma r^\alpha}{P_{T_S}}\right) \left(\frac{|\mathcal{A}' - \pi r_c^2|}{|\mathcal{A}'|} + \frac{\pi r_c^2}{|\mathcal{A}'|} F_H\left(\frac{\gamma r^\alpha}{P_{T_S}}\right)\right)^{M-1} f_R(r) f_G(g) dr dg \\ & + 1 - \int_\epsilon^{r_{\max}} F_H\left(\frac{\gamma r^\alpha}{P_{T_S}}\right) \left(\frac{|\mathcal{A}' - \pi r_c^2|}{|\mathcal{A}'|} + \frac{\pi r_c^2}{|\mathcal{A}'|} F_H\left(\frac{\gamma r^\alpha}{P_{T_S}}\right)\right)^{M-1} f_R(r) dr. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

*Corollary 4:* For the cooperation-based protocol, the  $n$ -th moment of the interference at an arbitrarily located PU-Rx due to an independently and uniformly distributed SU inside an arbitrarily-shaped finite region is approximated by

$$\mu_I(n) \approx P_T^n \mathbb{E}_G\{G^n\} \mathbb{E}_R\left\{F_H\left(\frac{\gamma R^\alpha}{P_{T_S}}\right) \left(\frac{|\mathcal{A}' - \pi r_c^2|}{|\mathcal{A}'|} + \frac{\pi r_c^2}{|\mathcal{A}'|} F_H\left(\frac{\gamma R^\alpha}{P_{T_S}}\right)\right)^{M-1} R^{-n\alpha}\right\}. \quad (30)$$

Proof of Theorem 4 and Corollary 4: See Appendix A-D.

*Remark 5:* To the best of our knowledge, it is not possible to express (29) and (30) in closed-form, even for the special case of PU-Rx located at the center of the disk region. This is because (29) and (30) contain one term, related to the RV  $R$ , which is raised to the power of  $M - 1$  ( $M \geq 2$ ) inside the expectation. Nevertheless, (29) and (30) can easily be evaluated numerically. Also, if  $r_c = 0$ , the term raised to the power of  $M - 1$  becomes one and (29) and (30) reduce to (26) and (27).

Substituting (17), (22), (26) and (29) into (11) the MGF of the aggregate interference for the SU activity protocols can be calculated for an arbitrarily located PU-Rx inside an arbitrarily-shaped convex region. Similarly, we can find the  $n$ -th cumulant of the aggregate interference by substituting (18), (23), (27) and (30) into (12) and the outage probability in the primary network by substituting (17), (22), (26) and (29) into (16) and (15).

## V. AVERAGE NUMBER OF ACTIVE SECONDARY USERS

The aggregate interference at the PU-Rx and the resulting outage probability are metrics to evaluate the performance of the primary network, which was the common focus of prior studies on cognitive networks, e.g., [18]–[21]. In order to evaluate the performance of the secondary network in underlay cognitive networks, we propose an important performance metric, the average number of active SUs,

which reflects the efficient reuse on the licensed spectrum. The main result for this metric is presented in Theorem 5 below.

*Theorem 5:* For any SU activity protocol with independently and uniformly distributed SUs inside an arbitrarily shaped finite region, the average number of active SUs is given by

$$\overline{M}_{\text{active}} = M \times \mu_I(0), \quad (31)$$

where  $\mu_I(0)$  denotes the zero-th moment of the interference at an arbitrarily located PU-Rx from a random SU, which is dependent on the SU activity protocol.

Proof: See Appendix A-E.

*Remark 6:* Theorem 5 is valid for any SU activity protocol with i.u.d. node distribution and i.i.d. fading channels. For the protocols considered in this work, the value of  $\mu_I(0)$  can be easily computed from (18), (23), (27) and (30), respectively.

*Remark 7:* Intuitively, there is tradeoff between the primary network performance (i.e., in terms of the outage probability in the primary network) and the secondary network performance (i.e., in terms of the average number of active SUs). For example, increasing  $r_f$  in the guard zone protocol or decreasing the activation threshold  $\gamma$  in threshold-based and cooperation-based protocols can reduce the outage probability. However, this would decrease the number of active secondary users, which means the licensed spectrum is not efficiently reused. In this context, (15) and (31) provide an analytical means for evaluating this tradeoff in the performance of both the primary and secondary networks. In the next section, we will use the primary-secondary performance tradeoff as a systematic way to compare the performance of the different SU activity protocols.

## VI. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we present numerical results to investigate and compare the performance of the four SU activity protocols. We also present simulation results to verify the derived analytical results. The numerical as well as the simulation results are generated using MATLAB. For the simulation results, we have used

TABLE I  
VALUES OF THE MAIN SYSTEM PARAMETERS.

| Parameter                       | Symbol                  | Value |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-------|
| Number of secondary users       | $M$                     | 100   |
| Transmit powers                 | $P_{T_S}, P_{T_0}, P_T$ | 1     |
| SINR threshold                  | $\beta$                 | 0 dB  |
| Signal-to-noise ratio           | $\rho_0$                | 20 dB |
| Reference distance              | $r_0$                   | 5     |
| Primary exclusion zone radius   | $\epsilon$              | 1     |
| Path-loss exponent              | $\alpha$                | 2.5   |
| Nakagami- $m$ fading parameters | $m_0 = m_g = m_h$       | 3     |




Fig. 2. Outage probability,  $P_{\text{out}}$ , versus the radius of the cooperation range,  $r_c$ , for the cases that the PU-Rx is located at the center and circumference, respectively, of a disk region with radius  $W = 100$ .

the acceptance-rejection method [35] to uniformly distribute the SUs inside an arbitrarily-shaped region and averaged the results over 10 million simulation runs. Unless specified otherwise, the values of the main system parameters shown in Table I are used.

### A. Cooperation-based Protocol

In this subsection, we investigate the accuracy of the cooperation-based protocol analysis in Section IV-D.

Fig. 2 plots the outage probability,  $P_{\text{out}}$ , versus the radius of the cooperation range,  $r_c$ , when the PU-Rx is located at the center and circumference, respectively, of a disk region with radius  $W = 100$ . The analytical result is plotted using Theorem 4 and substituting it into (16) and (15). It can be concluded that the analytical results match closely with the simulation results under the condition that the cooperation range is relatively small compared to the size of the cognitive network region. For the considered disk case, the analytical result is accurate as long as the radius of the cooperation region is less than 10, i.e., one tenth of the radius of the disk region. We can also see from the figure that the outage probability decreases as  $r_c$  increases, because the opportunity of being active for each SU decreases, which reduces the aggregate interference and improves the primary network's performance.

### B. Moments of Aggregate Interference and Outage Probability

In this subsection, we consider an arbitrary shape of the cognitive network, as depicted in Fig. 1(a), with side lengths  $S_1 = S_2 = 100\sqrt{3}$ ,  $S_3 = 100\sqrt{7 - 3\sqrt{3} - \sqrt{6}}$  and  $S_4 = 100$ . The PU-Rx is located at the intersection point of the two diagonals. The radius of the guard zone and the cooperative range are set to  $r_f = 30$  and  $r_c = 5$ , respectively. The activation threshold for both the threshold-based and the cooperation-based protocols is set to  $\gamma = 10^{-5}$ .

We investigate and compare the moments of the aggregate interference and the outage probability for the four SU activity protocols. Table II shows the 1st, 2nd and 3rd moment of the aggregate interference for the four SU activity protocols. The analytical results are computed using the mathematical formulation proposed in Section III-D and the  $n$ -th moment results in Corollaries 1–4. In addition, Fig. 3 plots the outage probability,  $P_{\text{out}}$ , versus the average signal-to-noise-ratio,  $\rho_0$  (defined below (15)), using the mathematical formulation proposed in Section III-E and the MGF results in Theorems 1–4. In both Table II

TABLE II

VALIDATION OF THE 1ST, 2ND AND 3RD MOMENT OF THE FOUR SU ACTIVITY PROTOCOLS.

| type              | 1st moment              |                         | 2nd moment              |                         | 3rd moment               |                          |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                   | analytical              | simulation              | analytical              | simulation              | analytical               | simulation               |
| Full Activity     | $8.2031 \times 10^{-2}$ | $8.1930 \times 10^{-2}$ | $2.7914 \times 10^{-2}$ | $2.7815 \times 10^{-2}$ | $2.5033 \times 10^{-2}$  | $2.4893 \times 10^{-2}$  |
| Guard zone        | $3.8571 \times 10^{-3}$ | $3.8571 \times 10^{-3}$ | $1.5235 \times 10^{-5}$ | $1.5235 \times 10^{-5}$ | $6.1590 \times 10^{-8}$  | $6.1587 \times 10^{-8}$  |
| Threshold-based   | $2.1669 \times 10^{-4}$ | $2.1669 \times 10^{-4}$ | $5.2407 \times 10^{-8}$ | $5.2402 \times 10^{-8}$ | $1.4251 \times 10^{-11}$ | $1.4237 \times 10^{-11}$ |
| Cooperation-based | $1.5497 \times 10^{-4}$ | $1.5728 \times 10^{-4}$ | $2.7512 \times 10^{-8}$ | $2.8505 \times 10^{-8}$ | $5.6546 \times 10^{-12}$ | $5.9951 \times 10^{-12}$ |




Fig. 3. Outage probability,  $P_{\text{out}}$ , versus the average signal-to-noise ratio,  $\rho_0$  (defined below (15)), for the case that the PU-Rx is located at the intersection point of two diagonals inside the arbitrarily-shaped finite region defined in Fig. 1(a).

and Fig. 3, the simulation results are an excellent match with the analytical results, which confirms the accuracy of the results in Theorems 1–4 and Corollaries 1–4.

We can see that for the considered scenario, the proposed cooperation-based protocol has the smallest values of the outage probability as well as the moments, i.e., it results in the smallest aggregate interference. The next best is the threshold-based protocol, followed by the guard zone protocol. The full activity protocol performs the worst because all SUs are allowed to transmit. However, such a comparison may not be fair because it focuses on the performance in the primary network only and ignores the performance




Fig. 4. Average number of active SUs,  $\bar{M}_{active}$ , versus the outage probability,  $P_{out}$ , for the case that the PU-Rx is located at the intersection point of two diagonals inside the arbitrarily-shaped finite region defined in Fig. 1(a) having area  $|\mathcal{A}| = 31415$  with  $M = 300$  SUs and i.i.d. Nakagami- $m$  fading ( $m = 3$ ).

in the secondary network.

### C. Comparison of Secondary User Activity Protocols

In this section, we investigate the primary-secondary performance tradeoff for the different SU activity protocols. We regard such a tradeoff as a comprehensive method to compare the performance of the SU activity protocols in terms of their effect on the primary network (i.e., the outage probability) and the secondary network (i.e., the average number of active SUs).

Fig. 4 plots the average number of active SUs versus the outage probability for the case that the PU-Rx is located at the intersection point of two diagonals inside the arbitrarily-shaped finite region defined in Fig. 1(a) having area  $|\mathcal{A}| = 31415$  with  $M = 300$  SUs and i.i.d. Nakagami- $m$  fading ( $m = 3$ ). Note that for the full activity protocol, even though the average number of active SUs is 300, the outage probability is 0.956076, i.e., the outage probability is nearly 1. The following approach is adopted to work out the tradeoff curves for the other protocols:

- 1) for each outage probability value, using (15), (16) and Theorem 2 – 4, we can find the value of  $r_f$  for

guard zone protocol and  $\gamma$  for threshold-based protocol and cooperation-based protocol, respectively;

- 2) we substitute the value  $r_f$  and  $\gamma$  into (31) and Corollary 2 – 4 to obtain the average number of active SUs for each protocol.

For the same outage probability, a better protocol should have a larger average number of active SUs. From Fig. 4, we can see that the guard zone protocol is the best, followed by the cooperation-based protocol and the threshold-based protocol.

This ordering can be intuitively explained as follows. The guard zone protocol performs the best because it enables the SUs to determine their “average” impact on the PU-Rx from long-term sensing signal monitoring. The outage probability is usually caused by the SUs that are close to the PU-Rx. By forming a proper guard zone region around the PU-Rx, the interference from the nearby SUs is avoided and on average more SUs are allowed to transmit. The threshold-based protocol performs the worst due to the effect of uncorrelated fading between sensing and transmitting channels. For example, the fading on the sensing channel may be severe but the fading on the SU transmitting channel may be weak. Thus, the SU may detect a weak signal on the sensing channel and decide to transmit, which may generate severe interference for the PU-Rx. The cooperation-based protocol helps to minimize the effect of uncorrelated fading channels by utilizing the local information exchange among SUs. Therefore, the cooperation-based protocol allows a higher activation threshold while still meeting the same outage value. This results in the larger number of active SUs, compared to the threshold-based protocol.

Although the guard zone protocol performs the best, the implementation of this protocol is only possible in scenarios that allow a long-term sensing signal monitoring before SUs can transmit. On the other hand, the threshold-based and cooperation-based protocols only rely on the short-term signal monitoring, and hence, are applicable in a much wider range of scenarios.

## VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have proposed a framework to analyze the performance of arbitrarily-shaped underlay cognitive networks with different SU activity protocols. The framework depends on the MGF of the

interference due to a random SU and allows closed-form computation of the outage probability in the primary network as well as the average number of active SUs in the secondary network. We have also applied cooperation in the context of the underlay cognitive network to come up with a cooperation-based SU activity protocol, which includes the existing threshold-based protocol as a special case. A tradeoff analysis between the outage probability and the average number of active SUs is proposed in this paper and we use it as the approach to compare the performance of different SU activity protocols on the underlay cognitive networks. Our results show that, in the short-term signal monitoring scenarios, the cooperation-based protocol improves the networks' performance compared to the threshold-based protocol. Future work can consider the generalization of cooperation-based protocol with multiple activation thresholds, which is outside the scope of the present work.

## APPENDIX A

### PROOF OF THEOREMS AND COROLLARIES

In this appendix, we derive the moment generating function of the interference from a random SU and the corresponding  $n$ -th moment for the SU activity protocols.

From (4), (5) and (6), we can see that whether a random SU generates interference or not is strongly dependent on the SU's random distance to the PU-Rx,  $R$ . The conditional probability mass function (PMF) of the interference from a SU is given by

$$\Pr(I = \mathbb{I}|R) = \begin{cases} P_{\text{active}|R}, & \mathbb{I} = P_T G R^{-\alpha}; \\ 1 - P_{\text{active}|R}, & \mathbb{I} = 0; \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

where  $P_{\text{active}|R}$  represents the conditional probability that a SU is active, which is conditioned on its random distance  $R$  to the PU-Rx.

Using (32), we can express the MGF of the interference from a random SU (defined below (11)) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_I(s) &= \mathbb{E}_I \{ \exp(-sI) \} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_G \{ \mathbb{E}_R \{ \Pr(I = \mathbb{I} | R) \exp(-s\mathbb{I}) \} \} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_G \{ \mathbb{E}_R \{ P_{\text{active}|R} \exp(-sP_T G R^{-\alpha}) \} \} + \mathbb{E}_G \{ \mathbb{E}_R \{ (1 - P_{\text{active}|R}) \exp(-s \times 0) \} \} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{G,R} \{ P_{\text{active}|R} \exp(-sP_T G R^{-\alpha}) \} + 1 - \mathbb{E}_R \{ P_{\text{active}|R} \}.
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Substituting (33) into (13), the  $n$ -th moment of the interference from a random SU is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_I(n) &= (-1)^n \mathbb{E}_{G,R} \{ P_{\text{active}|R} (-1)^n P_T^n G^n R^{-n\alpha} \exp(-sP_T G R^{-\alpha}) \} \big|_{s=0} \\
&= P_T^n \mathbb{E}_G \{ G^n \} \mathbb{E}_R \{ P_{\text{active}|R} R^{-n\alpha} \}.
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

We now define and use the value of the conditional probability  $P_{\text{active}|R}$  for different SU activity protocol to derive the main analytical results in the paper.

#### A. Proof of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1

*Proof:* For the full activity protocol, every SU is active. As a result, the conditional probability of a SU being active is always one. After substituting  $P_{\text{active}|R} = 1$  into (33) and (34), we arrive at the results in Theorem 1 and Corollary 1. ■

#### B. Proof of Theorem 2 and Corollary 2

*Proof:* For the guard zone protocol, (4) shows that the interference from a random SU is given by  $P_T G R^{-\alpha} \mathbf{1}_{(R > r_f)}$ . Thus, the conditional probability that a SU is active can be expressed as

$$P_{\text{active}|R} = \begin{cases} 1, & R > r_f; \\ 0, & R \leq r_f; \end{cases} \tag{35}$$

Substituting (35) into (33) and (34), the MGF and  $n$ -th moment of the interference from a random SU for the guard zone protocol are respectively given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}_I(s) &= \int_0^\infty \left( \int_\epsilon^{r_f} 0 \times \exp(-sP_T g r^{-\alpha}) f_R(r) dr + \int_{r_f}^{r_{\max}} 1 \times \exp(-sP_T g r^{-\alpha}) f_R(r) dr \right) f_G(g) dg \\ &\quad + 1 - \left( \int_\epsilon^{r_f} 0 \times f_R(r) dr + \int_{r_f}^{r_{\max}} 1 \times f_R(r) dr \right) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_{r_f}^{r_{\max}} \exp(-sP_T g r^{-\alpha}) f_R(r) f_G(g) dr dg + F_R(r_f),\end{aligned}\quad (36)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_I(n) &= P_T^n \mathbb{E}_G \{G^n\} \left( \int_\epsilon^{r_f} 0 \times R^{-n\alpha} f_R(r) dr + \int_{r_f}^{r_{\max}} 1 \times R^{-n\alpha} f_R(r) dr \right) \\ &= P_T^n \mathbb{E}_G \{G^n\} \int_{r_f}^{r_{\max}} R^{-n\alpha} f_R(r) dr.\end{aligned}\quad (37)$$

Hence, we arrive at the results in Theorem 2 and Corollary 2. ■

### C. Proof of Theorem 3 and Corollary 3

*Proof:* For the threshold-based protocol, (5) shows that the interference from a random SU is given by  $P_T G R^{-\alpha} \mathbf{1}_{(P_{TS} H R^{-\alpha} \leq \gamma)}$ , i.e., the SU generates interference as long as  $H \leq \frac{\gamma R^\alpha}{P_{TS}}$  when the distance to PU-Rx is given. Thus, the conditional probability that a SU is active can be written as

$$P_{\text{active}|R} = \int_0^{\frac{\gamma R^\alpha}{P_{TS}}} f_H(h) dh = F_H \left( \frac{\gamma R^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right). \quad (38)$$

Substituting (38) into (33) and (34), we can express the MGF and  $\mu_I(n)$  of the interference from a random SU as

$$\mathcal{M}_I(s) = \int_0^\infty \int_\epsilon^{r_{\max}} \exp(-sP_T g r^{-\alpha}) F_H \left( \frac{\gamma r^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right) f_R(r) f_G(g) dr dg + 1 - \int_0^\infty F_H \left( \frac{\gamma r^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right) f_R(r) dr, \quad (39)$$

and

$$\mu_I(n) = P_T^n \mathbb{E}_G \{G^n\} \mathbb{E}_R \left\{ F_H \left( \frac{\gamma R^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right) R^{-n\alpha} \right\}. \quad (40)$$

Hence, we arrive at the results in Theorem 3 and Corollary 3. ■

#### D. Proof of Theorem 4 and Corollary 4

*Proof:* For the cooperation-based protocol, consider a typical SU node A, cooperating with node B, as shown in Fig 1(d). Given the position of node A, let  $p_{nt}$  represents the conditional probability that node B leads to node A deciding not to transmit. This event occurs when node B falls into the cooperative region  $\mathcal{D}_A(r_c)$  around the typical user A and the detected signal at node B is greater than the activation threshold  $\gamma$ . Using this fact, we can express  $p_{nt}$  as

$$p_{nt} = \int_{\mathcal{D}_A(r_c) \times \mathcal{A}'} \int_{\frac{\gamma r_B^\alpha}{P_{TS}}}^{\infty} f_{H_B}(h_B) dh_B dx_B dy_B = \int_{\mathcal{D}_A(r_c) \times \mathcal{A}'} \left( 1 - F_{H_B} \left( \frac{\gamma r_B^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right) \right) dx_B dy_B, \quad (41)$$

where  $r_B = \sqrt{x_B^2 + y_B^2}$  is the distance from node B to the PU-Rx<sup>1</sup>,  $(x_B, y_B)$  is the coordinate of node B,  $f_{H_B}(h_B)$  represents the fading power distribution on the user B's sensing channel and  $\int_{\mathcal{D}_A(r_c) \times \mathcal{A}'}$  denotes the integration over the overlap region between  $\mathcal{A}'$  and  $\mathcal{D}_A(r_c)$ .

We can see from (41) that  $p_{nt}$  is a function of the location of node A. Consequently, the integration in (41) is very complicated to evaluate in closed-form. In order to simplify the analysis, we assume that:

- the cooperation range  $r_c$  is small compared to the size of the cognitive network region;
- the SUs within the cooperation range experience the same path-loss;
- the effect from the boundary is neglected so that the overlap region is the same as the cooperative region irrespective of location of node A.

Thus, we can approximate (41) as

$$p_{nt} \approx \left( 1 - F_{H_B} \left( \frac{\gamma R_A^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right) \right) \int_{\mathcal{D}_A(r_c)} dx_B dy_B = \frac{\pi r_c^2}{|\mathcal{A}'|} - \frac{\pi r_c^2}{|\mathcal{A}'|} F_{H_B} \left( \frac{\gamma R_A^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right), \quad (42)$$

where  $R_A$  is the distance from node A to the PU-Rx.

The complement of the probability  $p_{nt}$ , denoted by  $1 - p_{nt}$ , is known as the probability that node B causes node A to transmit. In addition to node A, there are a total number of  $M - 1$  SUs which are independently distributed inside the network region. Consequently, the conditional probability that  $M - 1$  nodes can make node A to be active is  $(1 - p_{nt})^{M-1}$ , where  $p_{nt}$  is given by (42).

<sup>1</sup>The location of PU-Rx is assumed to be at the origin.

In order for node A to transmit, both the detected signal powers from the SUs inside  $\mathcal{D}_A(r_c)$  and the detected signal power by node A must be less than the activation threshold  $\gamma$ . Since nodes are identically distributed, we can drop the subscript A in  $R_A$  and B in  $F_{H_B}(\cdot)$ . Thus, the conditional probability of a random SU being active can be expressed as

$$P_{\text{active}|R} \approx (1 - p_{nt})^{M-1} \int_0^{\frac{\gamma R^\alpha}{P_{TS}}} f_H(h) dh = \left( \frac{|\mathcal{A}' - \pi r_c^2|}{|\mathcal{A}'|} + \frac{\pi r_c^2}{|\mathcal{A}'|} F_H \left( \frac{\gamma r^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right) \right)^{M-1} F_H \left( \frac{\gamma r^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right). \quad (43)$$

Then the MGF and  $n$ -th for the interference from a random SU can be obtained by substituting (43) into (33) and (34) respectively, which can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_I(s) &\approx \int_0^\infty \int_\epsilon^{r_{\max}} \exp(-s P_T g r^{-\alpha}) F_H \left( \frac{\gamma r^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right) \left( \frac{|\mathcal{A}' - \pi r_c^2|}{|\mathcal{A}'|} + \frac{\pi r_c^2}{|\mathcal{A}'|} F_H \left( \frac{\gamma r^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right) \right)^{M-1} f_R(r) f_G(g) dr dg \\ &\quad + 1 - \int_\epsilon^{r_{\max}} F_H \left( \frac{\gamma r^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right) \left( \frac{|\mathcal{A}' - \pi r_c^2|}{|\mathcal{A}'|} + \frac{\pi r_c^2}{|\mathcal{A}'|} F_H \left( \frac{\gamma r^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right) \right)^{M-1} f_R(r) dr, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

and

$$\mu_I(n) \approx P_T^n \mathbb{E}_G \{G^n\} \mathbb{E}_R \left\{ F_H \left( \frac{\gamma R^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right) \left( \frac{|\mathcal{A}' - \pi r_c^2|}{|\mathcal{A}'|} + \frac{\pi r_c^2}{|\mathcal{A}'|} F_H \left( \frac{\gamma R^\alpha}{P_{TS}} \right) \right)^{M-1} R^{-n\alpha} \right\}. \quad (45)$$

Hence, we arrive at the results in Theorem 4 and Corollary 4. ■

#### E. Proof of Theorem 5

*Proof:* From definition,  $\overline{M}_{\text{active}}$  is the mean value of the number of active SUs, after averaging over all possible networking realizations. Let  $P_{\text{active}}$  denote the (unconditional) probability of a SU being active. Mathematically, the average number of active SUs can be written as

$$\overline{M}_{\text{active}} = M \times P_{\text{active}} = M \times \mathbb{E}_R \{P_{\text{active}|R}\}. \quad (46)$$

In order to further simplify (46), we can exploit the fact that  $P_T^0 = 1$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_G \{G^0\} = 1$  and  $R^0 = 1$ . Thus, we can rewrite (46) as

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{M}_{\text{active}} &= M \times 1 \times 1 \times \mathbb{E}_R \{P_{\text{active}|R} \times 1\} \\ &= M \times \underbrace{P_T^0 \mathbb{E}_G \{G^0\} \mathbb{E}_R \{P_{\text{active}|R} \times R^0\}}_{\mu_I(0)}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Comparing the latter term in (47) with (34), we can see that it is in fact the zero-th moment of the interference from a random SU. Thus, we arrive at the result in (31). ■

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Haykin, "Cognitive radio: Brain-empowered wireless communications," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 201–220, Feb. 2005.
- [2] R. Thomas, D. Friend, L. DaSilva, and A. MacKenzie, "Cognitive networks," in *Cognitive Radio, Software Defined Radio, and Adaptive Wireless Systems*, H. Arslan, Ed. Springer Netherlands, 2007, pp. 17–41.
- [3] Y. T. Hou, A. Wyglinski, M. Nekove, H. Zhang, R. Chandramouli, and F. Martin, "Guest editorial: Special issue on cognitive radio oriented wireless networks and communications," *Mobile. Netw. Appl.*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 411–415, 2008.
- [4] B. Wang and K. Liu, "Advances in cognitive radio networks: A survey," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 5–23, Feb. 2011.
- [5] "Spectrum policy task force report," *FCC Doc. ET Docket*, no. 02-135, Nov. 2002.
- [6] Q. Zhao and B. Sadler, "A survey of dynamic spectrum access," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 79–89, May 2007.
- [7] R. Menon, R. M. Buehrer, and J. H. Reed, "Outage probability based comparison of underlay and overlay spectrum sharing techniques," in *Proc. IEEE DySPAN 2005*, Nov 2005, pp. 101–109.
- [8] I. F. Akyildiz, W.-Y. Lee, M. C. Vuran, and S. Mohanty, "Next generation/dynamic spectrum access/cognitive radio wireless networks: A survey," *Comput. Netw.*, vol. 50, no. 13, pp. 2127–2159, Sep. 2006.
- [9] A. Ghasemi and E. Sousa, "Interference aggregation in spectrum-sensing cognitive wireless networks," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 41–56, Feb. 2008.
- [10] Y. Chen and N. Beaulieu, "Performance of collaborative spectrum sensing for cognitive radio in the presence of gaussian channel estimation errors," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 1944–1947, Jul. 2009.
- [11] H. Li, H. Dai, and C. Li, "Collaborative quickest spectrum sensing via random broadcast in cognitive radio systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 9, no. 7, pp. 2338–2348, Jul. 2010.
- [12] P. J. Kolodzy, "Interference temperature: A metric for dynamic spectrum utilization," *Int. J. Netw. Manage.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 103–113, Mar. 2006.
- [13] M. Vu, S. Ghassemzadeh, and V. Tarokh, "Interference in a cognitive network with beacon," in *Proc. IEEE WCNC*, Mar. 2008, pp. 876–881.
- [14] A. Kahlon, S. Periyalar, H. Yanikomeroglu, and S. Szyszkowicz, "Outage in a cellular network overlaid with an ad hoc network: The uplink case," in *Proc. IEEE PIMRC*, Sep. 2011, pp. 588–592.
- [15] M. Derakhshani and T. Le-Ngoc, "Aggregate interference and capacity-outage analysis in a cognitive radio network," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 196–207, Jan. 2012.
- [16] M. G. Khoshkholgh, K. Navaie, and H. Yanikomeroglu, "Outage performance of the primary service in spectrum sharing networks," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 12, no. 10, pp. 1955–1971, Aug. 2013.
- [17] —, "Optimal design of the spectrum sensing parameters in the overlay spectrum sharing," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, 2013 (to appear).

- [18] C. han Lee and M. Haenggi, "Interference and outage in poisson cognitive networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 1392–1401, Apr. 2012.
- [19] N. Mahmood, F. Yilmaz, M. Alouini, and G. Oien, "Cognitive interference modeling with applications in power and admission control," in *Proc. IEEE DYSpan*, Oct. 2012, pp. 434–439.
- [20] L. Vijayandran, P. Dharmawansa, T. Ekman, and C. Tellambura, "Analysis of aggregate interference and primary system performance in finite area cognitive radio networks," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 60, no. 7, pp. 1811–1822, Jul. 2012.
- [21] A. Rabbachin, T. Quek, H. Shin, and M. Win, "Cognitive network interference," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 480–493, Jan. 2011.
- [22] S. Srinivasa and M. Haenggi, "Modeling interference in finite uniformly random networks," in *Proc. IEEE ITW*, Jun. 2007.
- [23] E. Salbaroli and A. Zanella, "Interference analysis in a poisson field of nodes of finite area," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 1776–1783, May 2009.
- [24] J. Guo, S. Durrani, and X. Zhou, "Outage probability in arbitrarily-shaped finite wireless networks," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 699–712, Feb. 2014.
- [25] I. S. Gradshteyn and I. M. Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products*, 7th ed. Academic Press, 2007.
- [26] M. Vu, N. Devroye, and V. Tarokh, "On the primary exclusive region of cognitive networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 8, no. 7, pp. 3380–3385, Jul. 2009.
- [27] M. K. Simon and M.-S. Alouini, *Digital Communication over Fading Channels*, 2nd ed. Wiley, 2005.
- [28] H. ElSawy, E. Hossain, and M. Haenggi, "Stochastic geometry for modeling, analysis, and design of multi-tier and cognitive cellular wireless networks: A survey," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 996–1019, Jul. 2013.
- [29] R. V. Hogg and A. T. Craig, *Introduction to Mathematical Statistics*, 6th ed. Pearson, 2004.
- [30] M. Nakagami, *The m-Distribution, a general formula of intensity of rapid fading*, I. W. C. Hoffman, Ed. Pergamon Press, 1960.
- [31] Z. Khalid and S. Durrani, "Distance distributions in regular polygons," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 2363–2368, Jun. 2013.
- [32] M. Haenggi, *Stochastic Geometry for Wireless Networks*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [33] M. Haenggi and R. K. Ganti, *Interference in Large Wireless Networks*. NOW: Foundations and Trends in Networking, 2009.
- [34] A. M. Hunter, J. G. Andrews, and S. Weber, "Transmission capacity of ad hoc networks with spatial diversity," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 7, no. 12, pp. 5058–5071, Dec. 2008.
- [35] W. L. Martinez and A. R. Martinez, *Computational Statistics Handbook with Matlab*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2001.